

REMARKS

Claims 37-72 were pending in the application. Claims 1-72 have been canceled. Claims 73-92 have been added. Therefore, claims 73-92 remain pending.

The Examiner rejected the previously pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) using a variety of references, including Obenhuber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638), and Demuth et al. ("Securing the Anonymity of Content Providers in the World Wide Web", SPIE Conference, San Jose, January 1999), and Farah M. ("Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol –UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network Working Group). In view of the cancellation of claims 1-72, these rejections are believed moot.

With regard to newly submitted independent claim 73, Applicant submits that the cited art does not, among other things, teach or suggest: "wherein said request includes both an encrypted address of said web page and an unencrypted address of a third Internet domain that is different from said second Internet domain." Neither does the cited art appear to teach or suggest "wherein said sending data includes encrypting said data, wherein said encrypted data includes said retrieved web page," as in claim 73. Instead, Obenhauser, for example, is merely concerned with "providing multiple users with access to...the Internet." *See* Obenhauser, col. 1, lines 50-53. Thus, Obenhauser does not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 73.

With regard to newly submitted independent claim 82, Applicant submits that the cited art does not, among other things, teach or suggest "said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain; said server sending data to said computer over the secure connection via the firewall." Instead, Demuth, for example, is primarily concerned with situations in which "the identity of the content provider stays hidden to the user...." *See* Demuth, p. 496, lines 33-34.

With regard to newly submitted independent claims 84 and 89, these claims are believed allowable for reasons similar to those specified for claim 73.

For at least the reasons cited above, independent claims 73, 82, 84, and 89, along with their respective dependent claims, are believed patentably distinct over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6002-03300/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2006

By: 

Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847